

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 10-11 and 14-15 are amended.

Claims 6, 12-13 and 16 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iguchi et al., Pub. No.: US 2002/0169960 A1 (hereinafter "Iguchi") in view of De Roose, Pub. No.: US 2002/0049746 A1.

Claims 6 and 12-13 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection as it applies to claims 6 and 12-13 should be withdrawn.

Regarding the amended claim 1, neither Iguchi nor De Roose, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that if there is no space area for downloading or installing data in the first memory when requested, data which is accumulated in the first memory, is possible to be moved, and determined on the basis of an instruction from the electronic device is moved to the second memory.

As mentioned in the Office Action, Iguchi does not disclose such a moving process. Further, paragraph [0024], lines 12-13 in De Roose states that "all buffers filled with data at the

time are written to the backup file and then released.” From the statement it is apparent that De Roose teaches all data are moved to the backup file when there is no space to be downloaded. Accordingly, De Roose does not disclose that data which is accumulated in the first memory, is possible to be moved, and determined on the basis of an instruction from the electronic device is moved to the second memory, as recited in the amended claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Iguchi and De Roose does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Iguchi and De Roose does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-11, 14-15 and 17 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/782,556
Amdt. Dated: December 14, 2009
Reply to Office action of September 15, 2009

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-36462.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 14, 2009